



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,438	09/11/2003	Branko D. Kovacevic	1376-0200220	7502
34456 7590 03/23/2009 LARSON NEWMAN ABEL & POLANSKY, LLP 5914 WEST COURTYARD DRIVE SUITE 200 AUSTIN, TX 78730				
EXAMINER				
BATES, KEVIN T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2456				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/23/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/660,438

Applicant(s)

KOVACEVIC, BRANKO D.

Examiner

KEVIN BATES

Art Unit

2456

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 46-57 and 59-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 46-57, and 59-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/808)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on January 15, 2009.

Claims 1-3, 6-7, and 46 are currently amended.

Claims 59-66 are newly added.

Claims 14-45 and 58 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-13 and 46-57, and 59-66 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claim 58 is listed in the amendment as (Cancelled), but still lists the previous claim limitations. The examiner will treat this claim as actually cancelled and not examine that claim.

Claims 59 and 63, recite the limitation "in response to determining the **second processed result matches an expected result**, parsing a second packet of the first data stream based on the **first protocol**." So in summary, based on determining that the data streaming is transmitting at a second protocol, we parse the second packet in that stream according to the first protocol. It is unclear from the context whether this is a typo or part of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claim recites the limitation “the group consisting of comprising”, this particular language makes it unclear. Appropriate action is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10, 13, 46-54, 57, and 59-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto (7280566) in view of Gentry (6356951).

Regarding claims 1 and 46, Okamoto teaches a method comprising the steps of: receiving a first data stream of multimedia data, determining the protocol of the first stream, parsing a second packet of the first data stream based on the determined first protocol (Col. 23, lines 18 – 36; Col. 23, line 29 – Col. 24, line 10).

Okamoto does not explicitly indicate selecting a first protocol from a plurality of available protocols; processing a first packet of the first data stream based on the first test protocol to determine a first processed result: and in response to determining the first processed result matches an expected result, choosing the protocol.

Gentry teaches a protocol determination system that includes selecting a first protocol from a plurality of available protocols; processing a first packet of the first data

stream based on the first test protocol to determine a first processed result: and in response to determining the first processed result matches an expected result, choosing the protocol (Col. 21, lines 30 – 51; Col. 22, lines 39 – 64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Gentry's teaching of a programmed instructions for each of select protocol to have an editable updatable system for testing unknown packets for the selected/programmed protocol.

Regarding claim 2, Okamoto teaches the method as in claim 1, wherein the first protocol selected from the group consisting of comprising MPEG-2, Direct TV, and DVD protocols (Col. 23, lines 56 – 64).

Regarding claims 3 and 47, Okamoto teaches The method as in claims 1 and 46, further comprising: storing a second portion of the first data stream in memory after the step of selecting the first protocol (Col. 23, lines 37 – 45).

Regarding claims 4 and 48, Okamoto teaches The method as in claims 3 and 47, wherein the second portion of the first data stream is received after the first portion of the first data stream (Col. 23, lines 37 – 45; where the second portion is the step of keeping the packet information to extract further information).

Regarding claims 5 and 49, Okamoto teaches the method as in claims 3 and 47, wherein the second portion of the first data stream includes the first portion of the first data stream (Col. 23, lines 37 – 45).

Regarding claims 6 and 50, Okamoto teaches the method as in claims 3 and 47, further comprising generating a database based on parsing the second packet (Col. 25, lines 59 – Col. 26, line 58).

Regarding claims 7 and 51, Okamoto teaches the method as in claims 6 and 50, further comprising parsing the second packet comprises a first set of descriptors associated with the first data stream (Col. 23, lines 40 - 46).

Regarding claims 8 and 52, Okamoto teaches the method as in claims 7 and 51, wherein the first set of descriptors includes a descriptor from the set of descriptors comprising a network identifier, multiplex information, and program information (Col. 23, lines 40 - 65).

Regarding claims 9 and 53, Okamoto teaches the method as in claims 8 and 52, wherein multiplex information includes transport stream identifiers and program identifiers (Col. 23, lines 40 - 46).

Regarding claims 10 and 54, Okamoto teaches the method as in claims 8 and 52, wherein the program information includes program numbers, program recovery clock identifiers, video data identifiers and audio data identifiers (Col. 2, lines 20 – 62; Col. 4, line 46 – Col. 5, line 20).

Regarding claims 13 and 57, Okamoto teaches the method as in claims 1 and 47, wherein the memory includes a frame buffer (Col. 12, line 65 - Col. 13, line 16).

Regarding claims 59 and 63, Okamoto teaches the method of claims 1 and 46. Okamoto does not explicitly indicate in response to determining the first processed result does not match the expected result: selecting a second protocol from

the plurality of available protocols; processing the first packet based on the second test protocol to determine a second processed result; and in response to determining the second processed result matches an expected result, parsing a second packet of the first data stream based on the first protocol.

Gentry teaches in response to determining the first processed result does not match the expected result: selecting a second protocol from the plurality of available protocols; processing the first packet based on the second test protocol to determine a second processed result; and in response to determining the second processed result matches an expected result, parsing a second packet of the first data stream based on the first protocol (Col. 21, lines 30 – 51; Col. 22, lines 39 – 64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Gentry's teaching of a programmed instructions for each of select protocol to have an editable updatable system for testing unknown packets for the selected/programmed protocol.

Regarding claims 60 and 64, Okamoto teaches the method of claims 1 and 46, wherein selecting the first protocol comprises selecting a first start code from a plurality of available start codes, the first start code indicative of a type of multimedia stream (Col. 13, lines 41-46).

Regarding claims 61 and 65, Okamoto teaches the method of claim 1, wherein selecting the first protocol comprises selecting a first set of physical interface parameters from a plurality of available interface parameters (Col. 12, lines 55 – 59).

Regarding claims 62 and 66, Okamoto teaches the method of claims 1 and 46, wherein selecting the first protocol comprises selecting a first packet length from a plurality of available packet lengths (Col. 12, lines 55 – 59).

Claims 11-12 and 55-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto in view of Gentry, and in further view of the examiner's official notice.

Regarding claims 11 and 55, Okamoto teaches the method as in claims 8 and 52 and analyzing and filtering packet streams based on any type of extracted management information (Col. 4, line 46 – Col. 5, line 20) and whether is an elementary stream (Col 34, lines 30 - 39), but Okamoto does not explicitly indicate wherein the set of descriptors further includes elementary stream information and closed captioning information.

The examiner takes "official notice" that elementary stream information and closed captioning information are types of information that can be extracted from packets and used to help process a media stream.

Regarding claims 12 and 56, Okamoto teaches the method as in claims 11 and 55, and analyzing and filtering packet streams based on any type of extracted management information (Col. 4, line 46 – Col. 5, line 20) and whether is an elementary stream (Col 34, lines 30 - 39), but Okamoto does not explicitly indicate wherein the set of descriptors further includes elementary stream information and closed captioning information.

The examiner takes "official notice" that data stream types and elementary stream identifiers are types of information that can be extracted from packets and used to help process a media stream.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11 and 12 have been considered.

MPEP §2144.03 recites:

To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR 1.111(b). See also Chevenard, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241 ("[I]n the absence of any demand by appellant for the examiner to produce authority for his statement, we will not consider this contention."). A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without any reference to the examiner's assertion of official notice would be inadequate.

In this case the applicant has presented a general allegation that the material in claims 11 and 12 are not well known in the art, and that assertion is inadequate to properly traverse the examiner's official notice.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN BATES whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kevin Bates/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2456